

REMARKS

This application, as amended herein, contains claims 1 - 13, and newly added claim 14.

Claims 1, 3 - 5 and 7 - 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to the non-statutory subject matter.

To avoid controversy on this point, first the term "business" has been removed from the claims. Applicants' invention may be used for purposes other than conducting "business". Second, it is noted that there is no rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 of claims 2 and 6. By amendment herein, claim 1 now recites "using network links for gathering a plurality of reaction enabling tools." Claim 6 includes among other items "a link to one or more web pages with clearance to appropriate services from these pages." These are real technological recitations, that clearly meet the standard of State Street v. Signature Financial Group and AT&T Corp. v. Excel cited by the Examiner. The Examiner has admitted that the claims are limited by language to a useful, concrete and tangible result. This is all that is required under this case law.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miron. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended herein to recite a method for providing one or more alerts over a network. The method comprising the steps of:

composing one or more alert messages, which are sent to an alert database;

using network links for gathering a plurality of reaction enabling tools for a user to use in a collaborative manner to respond to the respective alert;

using data extracted from one or more databases, including the alert database, to dispatch the alert messages and corresponding reaction enabling tools to one or more of the clients over a network, the alert messages and corresponding reaction enabling tools that allow contact with facilities useful in responding to the alert.

Thus, the method of claim 1 uses using network links for gathering a plurality of reaction enabling tools for a client to use in a collaborative manner to respond to the respective alert. Miron clearly does not teach or suggest this aspect of claim 1.

Miron is directed to a system for transferring a delta file from a first computer to a second computer that includes a delta builder on the first computer, a download manager, and a restorer on the second computer. The first

computer has a first version of a file and a second version of the file, and the second computer has the first version of the file. The delta builder generates the delta file from the first and second versions on the first computer. The download manager transfers the delta file from the first computer to the second computer. The restorer generates the second version from the first version on the second computer and the transferred delta file.

While there is some general discussion in Miron of "push technology", there is no teaching or suggestion in Miron of using network links for gathering a plurality of reaction enabling tools for a client to use in a collaborative manner to respond to an alert, as set forth in claim 1. The method of claim 1 allows a user to bring an extensive range of resources to bear on solving problems, or for obtaining desired information. Miron is directed primarily to reducing Internet connection time by facilitating an update of an existing file. None of the portions of Miron, whether specifically cited by the Examiner or not, teach or suggest the recitation in claim 1 discussed above. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 1 is directed to patentable subject matter.

The remaining claims depend from independent claim 1. These claims further recitations, which when combined with the recitations of claim 1, are also directed to patentable subject matter.

Further, with respect to claims 2 - 13, it is noted that the Examiner is relying on Miron for "a client-server

system for managing versions of files on the client computer and the server computer, and for downloading versions of files form (sic) the server computer to the client computer." However, Applicants' invention, as set forth in claims 2 - 13 includes numerous recitations going far beyond what the Examiner has cited.

With specific reference to claim 2 the tool gathering is done by one or more of a manual process and automatic process and the combination of manual and automatic processes. Miron does not teach or suggest claim 2.

Further, Miron does not teach or suggest the contents of alert messages in claim 3, or the events as set forth in claim 4.

With respect to claim 5, Miron does not teach or suggest associating one or more of the response enabling tools to alerts by use of any one more of the recited response enabling tools. Further, Myron does not teach or suggest the list of response enabling tools set forth in claim 6.

Miron does not teach or suggest that one of the databases is a database of client information as set forth in claim 7 or that the response enabling tools are determined by the alert and a combination of the user information, as specifically set forth in claim 8.

With respect to claim 10, Miron does not teach or suggest providing access to otherwise protected service on

a temporary basis. Further, Miron does not specifically teach an exclusive service, an access to a web site and an access to privileged information, as set forth in claim 11.


Miron the not teach or suggest that a client includes one more of a website and a person as set forth in claim 12, or that the response tools include any one more of connection to multiple reaction system and connection to a collaborative system, as in claim 13.

Thus, for the reasons set forth above, and for the reasons as set forth with respect to claim 1, it is submitted that claims 2 - 13, are directed to patentable subject matter.

Newly added claim 14 recites the method of claim 1, further comprising establishing a community of interest of users in response to said alert. Support for this claim may be found at page 14, lines 6 - 11 of the specification. The prior art does not teach or suggest claim 14.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. A check for \$1,020 to cover the fee for a three month extension in which to respond to the office action is enclosed herewith.

Respectfully submitted,



David Aker, Reg. No. 29,277
23 Southern Road
Hartsdale, NY 10530

1/18/2005
Date

Tel. & Fax 914 674-1094